

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-20, 23-27 and 29-35 are currently pending in the application. Herein the applicant amends independent claims 1 and 23.

A. RESPONSE TO REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action the Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-20, 23-27 and 29-35 under 35 USC §112 as being indefinite. The applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 23 to provide further structural description. The claimed membrane has the unusual feature of very selectively and very freely passing the water component of the electrolyte solution, while at the same time acting as a highly efficient proton passing membrane. This unique combination enables the efficient and desirable operational effects of the claimed hydrogen generation system.

B. RESPONSE TO REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office action the Examiner rejects claims 1, 4-12, 34 and 35 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over a lost count and US patent 4,528,252 ("Yamazaki".) In response the applicant has amended the independent claims to more clearly define the structure of the membrane. The claimed membrane has the unusual feature of very selectively and very freely passing the water component of the electrolyte solution, while at the same time acting as a highly efficient proton passing membrane. Yamazaki fails to teach or suggest any such limitation. Accordingly, the combination of the lost count and Yamazaki cannot render the cited claims obvious.

In the Office action the Examiner rejects claims 3 and 15-19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over a lost count and US patent 4,528,252 ("Yamazaki") further in view of US patent 5,512,787 (Dederick.) In response the applicant has

amended the independent claims to more clearly define the structure of the membrane. The claimed membrane has the unusual feature of very selectively and very freely passing the water component of the electrolyte solution, while at the same time acting as a highly efficient proton passing membrane. Yamazaki fails to teach or suggest any such limitation. Accordingly, the combination cannot render the cited claims obvious.

In the Office action the Examiner rejects claims 13, 14, 23, 26, 27, 29 and 30 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over a lost count and US patent 4,528,252 ("Yamazaki") further in view of US patent 3,870,616 (Dempsey.) In response the applicant has amended the independent claims to more clearly define the structure of the membrane. The claimed membrane has the unusual feature of very selectively and very freely passing the water component of the electrolyte solution, while at the same time acting as a highly efficient proton passing membrane. Yamazaki fails to teach or suggest any such limitation. Accordingly, the combination cannot render the cited claims obvious.

In the Office action the Examiner rejects claim 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over a lost count and US patent 4,528,252 ("Yamazaki") further in view of US patent 4,052,228 (Russell.) In response the applicant has amended the independent claims to more clearly define the structure of the membrane. The claimed membrane has the unusual feature of very selectively and very freely passing the water component of the electrolyte solution, while at the same time acting as a highly efficient proton passing membrane. Yamazaki fails to teach or suggest any such limitation. Accordingly, the combination cannot render the cited claims obvious.

In the Office action the Examiner rejects claims 24 and 25 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over a lost count and US patent 4,528,252 ("Yamazaki") further in view of US patent 5,512,787 (Dederick.) In response the applicant has amended the

independent claims to more clearly define the structure of the membrane. The claimed membrane has the unusual feature of very selectively and very freely passing the water component of the electrolyte solution, while at the same time acting as a highly efficient proton passing membrane. Yamazaki fails to teach or suggest any such limitation. Accordingly, the combination cannot render the cited claims obvious.

In the Office action the Examiner rejects claims 31 and 32 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over a lost count and US patent 4,528,252 ("Yamazaki") further in view of US patent 4,352,722 (Ohkawa.) In response the applicant has amended the independent claims to more clearly define the structure of the membrane. The claimed membrane has the unusual feature of very selectively and very freely passing the water component of the electrolyte solution, while at the same time acting as a highly efficient proton passing membrane. Yamazaki fails to teach or suggest any such limitation. Accordingly, the combination cannot render the cited claims obvious.

B. CONCLUSION

The applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in a condition for allowance. If the Examiner would find it helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney of record.

Respectfully Submitted,



William J. Kolegraff
Law Office of Bill Kolegraff
3119 Turnberry Way
Jamul, CA 91935
Phone: (619) 401 8008
Fax: (619) (401) 0808